

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 and 12 are presently active in this case, Claim 1 having been amended, Claim 11 cancelled, and Claim 12 added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 1 was objected to as including an informality requiring correction. Claims 1-5, 7 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Sugano (JP 407221545A). Claims 1-6 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Pham (5,245,298) in view of Fong (6,147,559). However, Claims 8-10 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter. However, since Applicants believe themselves entitled to the scope stated in amended Claim 1, Claims 8-11 have been maintained in dependent form.

In response to the objection to Claim 1, the Examiner's suggested change to Claim 1 has been adopted, thereby to correct the noted informality. Accordingly, no further objection to Claim 1 is anticipated.

In light of the several grounds of rejection, Claim 1 has been amended to recite a first resistance element between the collector of the first transistor and the emitter of the second transistor, and to state the resistance of the first resistance element is such that a change in a potential appearing across the first resistance element is equal to a change in potential difference between the bases of the first and second transistors when the power supply potential changes. The specification has been amended accordingly.

As a result, according to the claimed invention defined by amended Claim 1, the base-collector voltage of the first transistor is maintained constant even when the power supply

potential changes, as is shown in Figure 3. In this way, the "pushing" phenomenon described at page 4, lines 23-27 of the specification, is prevented, consistent with, for example, the description at page 10, lines 1-18 of the specification. Accordingly, no new matter is believed to have been added by the present amendment, and the amended claims are believed patentably distinguishing over any combination of teachings of the applied Sugano, Pham and Fong references, since these references neither singly nor in combination teach or suggest an oscillator circuit provided with a first resistance element provided between the collector of one transistor and the emitter of another transistor and having a resistance as stated in amended Claim 1.

Accordingly, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome and pending Claims 1-10 and 12 are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870



22850